

Applicant: Keith Wiedow et al.
Application No.: 10/723,282
Art Unit: 1731

Remarks

Claims 1–10 remain pending in the application. In the Office action dated Oct. 29, 2004, claims 1–2, and 5–8 were rejected as anticipated by Gresham. Claims 9–10 were rejected as obvious in view of Gresham. Claims 3–4 were rejected as obvious over Gresham in view of Yoshitani.

The references applied by the examiner were submitted by applicant. Gresham is a known prior art type of crimper where the crimping wheels are brought into position by rotation, as in the prior art discussed in applicant's specification at ¶ [0004]:

The crimping wheels are typically mounted on a pivoting mechanism which brings the crimping wheels into engagement with the anvil roll. The pivot mechanism allows simple and rapid opening of the gap between the crimping wheels and the anvil roll which facilitates threading of the tissue webs.

The examiner has provided no support for the contention that Gresham “provides a linear means for providing pressure” unless this is a simple reference to the creation of linear lines of crimping. Gresham does not contain the word linear, and refers to the arms 11 (i.e., the support bracket) as stationary. Pivoting crimping wheels are known, see Nystrand or Clark et al ‘734.

Claim 1 has the limitation “the support bracket mounted by a linear bearing to the transverse carriage for vertical motion toward and away from the anvil roll” which is nowhere shown or suggested in the art of record, and particularly not in Gresham.

Yoshitani is from an unrelated art, and teaches using an air knife for removing liquid, or drying, but does not in any way suggest the limitations of claims 3–4 which prevent vibrations in a high speed crimper by cleaning lint from the crimping wheel to prevent eccentric mass on the crimping wheel which would produce vibration in the crimping wheel.

Koutonen, not applied by the examiner, shows a slitter arm mounted for vertical movement “with means for moving the support arm 21 vertically (arrow C).” Col. 3, lines 34–35. However Koutonen does not show a crimper. Although such slitters have been around for over

Applicant: Keith Wiedow et al.
Application No.: 10/723,282
Art Unit: 1731

20 years, the art of record does not show such technology has been applied to crimpers. There is no suggestion in Koutonen of any motivation or expectation of success in combining the structure of Koutonen with a crimper.


Claims 6 and 7 have distinct structural limitation:

- 6 ...the first linear actuator is disconnectable... arranged to be slid provide access to.....
7.locks in a raised position .. providing access....
8. ...a handle mounted to the first support bracket....

With respect to claims 9–10 the examiner fails to show any motivation for replacing one shaft with two, said claim limitation providing additional functionality not suggested by the art applied.

Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt1.res/amdt